



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,235	07/24/2003	Glen R. Harrelson	7186 CIP	1277	
26158	7590 04/27/2005		EXAMINER		
WOMBLE (CARLYLE SANDRID	GEHMAN, BRYON P			
P.O. BOX 70:	37 GA 30357-0037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2112111111,			3728		

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)			
	Office Astism C	10/626,2	235	HARRELSON, GI	LEN R.		
	Office Action Summary	Examine	er	Art Unit			
			Gehman	3728			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with	the correspondence ac	ddress		
A SH THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months a ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nunication. 0) days, a reply within the sta atutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the ap	vent, however, may a reply atutory minimum of thirty (30 will expire SIX (6) MONTHS plication to become ABANI	be timely filed b) days will be considered time from the mailing date of this of	ly. communication.		
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>04 April 2005</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 29-35</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>20, 24-28, 36-37 and 39</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>21-23 and 38</u> is/are objected to.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.	•				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b)☐ objected to by	the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any object						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to				• •		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation see the attached detailed Office action	documents have bed documents have bed of the priority docum nal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Appl ents have been rec le 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National	Stage		
			·				
Attachment	t(s)						
1) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			mary (PTO-413)			
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date	TO-948) PTO/SB/08)		ail Date nal Patent Application (PT	O-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/626,235

Art Unit: 3728

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

Page 2

States.

2. Claims 20, 24-28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Oliff et al. (5,368,194). Claims 20, 24-28 and 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stout (5,518,111). Disclosed is an enclosed

carton and a plurality of containers in first and second tiers, the carton comprising a

bottom panel (18; 40; respectively), a bottom side panel (22; 56), a top panel (12; 42), a

top side panel (14; 48), a plurality of flaps (30, 34, 68, 72; 58, 60, 66, 68, 74, 76, 90, 92)

closing ends of the carton, and a divider (90; 20) located between the tiers and having

first and second divider ends (at 94 and 98; 24 and adjacent portion of 22, and 26 and

adjacent portion of 22), the first divider end having a first split (96; 23) that divides the

first divider end into a first top end (between 104 and 96; portion of 22) and a first

bottom end (94; 24). The terms "top" and "bottom" of the divider end are not seen to

distinguish any particular arrangement. The folded portion (94; 24) is closer the bottom

than the unfolded portion (between 104 and 96; portion of 22).

As to claim 24, the divider width is necessarily a width less than the carton to fit

within the carton.

As to claim 25, a 24 count container carton is disclosed.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,235

Art Unit: 3728

As to claims 27 and 28, a dispenser opening (84 or 86; 12) is disclosed, the extent thereof failing to distinguish any unexpected result.

As to claim 39, the first top end (between 104 and 96; portion of 22) and first bottom end (94; 24) are foldable at their common edge (96; 23).

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 20, 24-28, 36-37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either one of Oliff et al. ('194) and Stout (5,518,111) in view of Chaussadas (5,031,770). Oliff et al. and Stout have been explained above and each discloses a divider (90; 20) in general. Chaussadas discloses a divider (as shown) including a split as much as claimed. To modify the enclosed carton of either Oliff et al. or Stout employing a divider with a split as disclosed by Chaussadas would fail to distinguish any new and unexpected result, as a divider including a split was known in the can carton divider and its selection as a divider would fail to distinguish any new or different result in combination with Oliff et al..

As to claim 24, the divider width is necessarily a width less than the carton to fit within the carton.

As to claim 25, a 24 count container carton is disclosed by Oliff et al. and Stout.

As to claim 26, Chaussadas discloses a second split opposed to the first split.

Page 4

As to claims 27 and 28, a dispenser opening (84 or 86; 12) is disclosed by Oliff et al. and Stout.

As to claims 36 and 37, the split is an aperture in Chaussadas as much as applicant's and extends inwardly from an edge along a length of the divider.

As to claim 39, the first top end (between 104 and 96; portion of 22) and first bottom end (94; 24) are foldable at their common edge (96; 23) in both Oliff et al. and Stout.

- 5. Applicant's arguments filed April 4, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. There is nothing in the claims that distinguishes the "split" from a fold line as in Oliff et al., as argued by applicant. What makes a "split"? Borders between countries often can not be easily ascertained, but they define a real "split" between the countries. Why does a fold line not constitute a "split"?
- 6. This action is made non-final in view of the new grounds of rejection.
- 7. Claims 1-19 and 29-35 are allowed.
- 8. Claims 21 and 38 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Dependent claims 22 and 23 would also then be allowable.

Art Unit: 3728

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shown are cartons with dividers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryon P. Gehman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4555. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Buya P. Sel

Bryon P. Gehman Primary Examiner Art Unit 3728

BPG